

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/642,419	08/15/2003	Marc Blumer	EFIM0073C1	1456		
31408	7590 10/06/2006		EXAMINER			
LAW OFFICE OF JAMES TROSINO			JOSEPH, JAISON			
92 NATOMA STREET, SUITE 211 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		2611			
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006	DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/642,419	10/642,419		BLUMER, MARC			
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Jaison Jose		2611				
The MAILING Period for Reply	DATE of this communication a	ppears on the c	over sheet with the co	orrespondence ad	ldress			
<ul> <li>WHICHEVER IS LC</li> <li>Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS from the long state of the long state o</li></ul>	ATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPONGER, FROM THE MAILING e available under the provisions of 37 CFR 10 m the mailing date of this communication. pecified above, the maximum statutory perionset or extended period for reply will, by statutoffice later than three months after the mail timent. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS  1.136(a). In no event,  In will apply and will e  ute, cause the applica	S COMMUNICATION , however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to	l. ely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) Responsive to	communication(s) filed on <u>15</u>	August 2003						
		·-	n-final					
<u> </u>	<ul> <li>This action is FINAL.</li> <li>2b)</li></ul>							
	ordance with the practice under	•			o monto io			
Disposition of Claims	,		· · ·					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <i>1-3</i> i	s/are pending in the application	1						
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
· <u> </u>								
	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	_ are subject to restriction and	or election rea	uirement.					
	are easyeet to reemenen and	, 0, 0,000,011,104						
Application Papers —	•							
· <u> </u>	on is objected to by the Examin							
10)∐ The drawing(s	) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	ccepted or b)	objected to by the E	xaminer.				
Applicant may	not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be	held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
<u> </u>	rawing sheet(s) including the corre	•			` '			
11) The oath or de	eclaration is objected to by the l	Examiner. Note	the attached Office	Action or form P	ΓΟ-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119							
	ent is made of a claim for foreio ome * c)□ None of:	gn priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1.☐ Certifie	d copies of the priority docume	nts have been	received.					
2.☐ Certifie	d copies of the priority docume	nts have been	received in Application	on No				
3. Copies	of the certified copies of the pr	iority document	is have been receive	d in this National	Stage			
applica	tion from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule	17.2(a)).		•			
* See the attache	ed detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certifie	d copies not receive	d.				
•								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References C	cited (PTO-892)	4	) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson	s Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	· _	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
3) Information Disclosure Paper No(s)/Mail Date	• • • •	6	Notice of Informal Party () Other:	atent Application				

Art Unit: 2611

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the Reference to related applications, the US Patent number should be provided.

Appropriate correction is required.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

## Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1, line 6 recite "a clock signal" should have been "the clock signal". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Butaud et al (US Patent 6,737,904).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claim 1, Butaud et al teach a spread spectrum for generating a reduced amplitude clock pulse from an original primary clock pulse, the system comprising; a clock signal generator for creating a series of clock pulses (see figure 2, System clock 52); a non-delayed line adapted to receive the series of clock pulses from the clock signal generator (see figure 2, the first signal line between component 52, and 56), a delay line comprising a delay time adapted to cause a clock signal transmitted to the delay line to be outputted after passage of the delay time (see figure 2, component 54), and a multiplexer a non-delay line input, a delay line input and an output, wherein the multiplexer receives output directly from the non-delayed line and the delay line (see figure 2, component 56), a state machine adapted to cause the multiplexer to select either the non-delayed line or the delayed line (see figure 2, component 68).

Regarding claim 2, Butaud et al teach a method for generating a clock input signal with reduces amplitude electromagnetic interference spectral components, comprising providing a means for generate a series of clock pulses (see figure 2, component 52), generating a serried of clock pulses (see the output of component 52), digitally demodulating the clock pulse by spreading the energy of the each clock pulse over a greater bandwidth (see figure 2, components 54, 56, 68) and generating a digitally modulated clock output signal (see figure 2, components 54, 56, 68 and the output signal of component 56).

Regarding claim 3, Butaud et al teach a clock circuit generating a clock signal with reduced amplitude electromagnetic interference spectral components comprising, oscillator means for generating a primary clock signal, wherein the primary clock signal

Art Unit: 2611

has a fundamental frequency with a fundamental amplitude (see figure 2, component 52), spread spectrum clock generating means cooperating with oscillator means for generating a spread spectrum clock output signal having a nominal frequency and reduced amplitude EMI spectral components at harmonics of nominal frequency, wherein the nominal frequency is substantially equivalent to the fundamental frequency, and wherein the nominal amplitude is lower than the fundamental amplitude (see figure 2, components 52, 54, 56, 64, 68, 58,).

#### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 – 3 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9, 13 and 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,317

Art Unit: 2611

respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 – 3 of the instant application merely broadens the scope of the claims 9,13 and 1of the Patent 6,643,317 by eliminating the elements and their functions of claims of the instant application. The preamble of the Patent recites, a spread spectrum system for generating a reduced amplitude clock pulse from an original primary clock pulse. However, it would to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that both inventions used to generate a reduced amplitude clock pulse from an original primary clock pulse. It has been held that the omission an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaison Joseph whose telephone number is (571) 272-6041. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on (571) 272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jaison Joseph 09/28/2006

> DAC HA PRIMARY EXAMINER